REMARKS

The foregoing amendments are responsive to the March 1, 2005 Office Action. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Rejection of Claim 3 under 35 USC 112

The Examiner rejected Claim 3 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, stating: "The claim recites 'a trigger is activated every predefined interval of time', indicating that only a specific trigger is activated at the predefined interval of time. No disclosure was found in the specification for this limitation."

The specification discloses that a trigger can be a timer event (paragraph [0247]). The specification also states that triggers include "events that are external to the traced application, such as a timer expiration . . . " (paragraph [0283]). Applicants have amended Claim 3 to clarify the language of the claim.

Applicants assert that Claim 3 is in condition for allowance, and Applicants request allowance of Claim 3.

Rejection of Claim 8 under 35 USC 112

In response to the Examiner's objection, Applicants have amended Claim 8 to correct the antecedent basis of the recited display screen and developer in Claim 8. This amendment adds no new matter.

Applicants assert that Claim 8 is in condition for allowance, and Applicants request allowance of Claim 8.

Rejection of Claim 23 under 35 USC 112

In response to the Examiner's objection, Applicants have amended Claim 23 to depend from Claim 22 in order to correct the antecedent basis of the recited "said condition."

Applicants assert that Claim 23 is in condition for allowance, and Applicants request allowance of Claim 23.

Rejection of Claim 27 under 35 USC 112

In response to the Examiner's objection, Applicants have amended Claim 27 to recite trace control information, as recited in Claim 26. This amendment adds no new matter.

Applicants assert that Claim 27 is in condition for allowance, and Applicants request allowance of Claim 27.

Rejection of Claim 31 under 35 USC 112

In response to the Examiner's objection, Applicants have amended Claim 31 to correct the antecedent basis of the recited trace control dataset.

Applicants assert that Claim 31 is in condition for allowance, and Applicants request allowance of Claim 31.

Rejection of Claims 6-35 Under Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

The Examiner rejected Claims 6-35 under obviousness-type double patenting as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,202,199 to Wygodny et al. ("Wygodny") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,732,210 to Buzbee.

The conditional expressions taught by Buzbee do not teach or suggest the triggers and actions of claims 6-35. According to Buzbee, "[b]cause the conditional expression is part of translated code 101, it is not necessary for debugger 99 to halt execution in order to evaluation [sic] the conditional expressions. Rather, when translated code 101 is executed, the conditional expressions included within the translated code 101 are evaluated. Only when the conditional expression is satisfied is a break instruction executed and control handed over to debugger 99." (Column 4 at lines 26-33). "Debugger 99 inserts the conditional breakpoints, including conditional expressions to be evaluated, within translated code 101. Debugger 99 does this indirectly by communicating with dynamic translator 100 to indicate what kind of conditional breakpoint to set and a location within translated code 101 for the condition al breakpoint.

Alternately, debugger 99 inserts the conditional breakpoints directly by adding lines of code into translated code 101." (Column 4 at lines 17-25).

Thus, the system of Buzbee is directed to dynamically-translated code operating under the control of a debugger. There is no suggestion to combine the dynamic translation and debugging system of Buzbee with the system and method for remotely analyzing the execution of computer programs of Wygodny. Applicants respectfully assert that the combination suggested by the examiner is based on hindsight.

Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the obviousness-type double-patenting rejection and allow Claims 6-36.

Rejection of Claims 1-2 and 5 Under 35 USC 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2 and 5 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,265,254 to Blasciak.

In the system described by Blasciak, code markers are inserted into the source code. The source then must be recompiled (*see e.g.*, Figure 4, items 402, 404, 406, and 408). By contrast, the method claimed by Applicants attaches to an executable module loaded in memory.

Specifically, regarding Claim 1, Blasciak does not teach or suggest generating trace control information which specifies triggers and associated actions, attaching to a computer program loaded into a computer memory for execution, tracing executing of the computer program according to the trace control information, such that when one of the triggers occurs the corresponding action is performed, and generating a trace log of the tracing, wherein the trace log reflects the actions performed during tracing.

Regarding Claim 2, Blasciak does not teach or suggest that the triggers of Claim 1 can include at least one of the following: the execution of the assembly code generated from a function entry, a function exit, or a source line; the activation of a software exception; the start or termination, normal or erroneous, of a process; and a user action.

Regarding Claim 5, Blasciak does not teach or suggest that the actions of Claim 1 can include at least one of the following: writing to said trace log the stack dump of functions active at a time of a trigger; saving said trace log to a file; writing a comment to said trace log; stopping said tracing of said execution; and resuming said tracing of said execution.

Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blasciak in view of Buzbee. Blasciak teaches that code markers are inserted into the source code which then must be recompiled. Buzbee teaches dynamic translation.

No combination of Buzbee and Blasciak teaches or suggests generating trace control information which specifies triggers and associated actions, attaching to a computer program loaded into a computer memory for execution, tracing executing of the computer program according to the trace control information, such that when one of the triggers occurs the corresponding action is performed, and generating a trace log of the tracing, wherein the trace log reflects the actions performed during tracing where at least some of the actions are activated only if a plurality of conditions are satisfied while the triggers are activated, and where the conditions include comparing values of data passed during execution to other values.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Claim 4 is patentable over the prior art, and Applicants request allowance of Claim 4.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, Applicants assert that Claims 1-36 are allowable, and Applicants request allowance of Claims 1-36. If there are any remaining issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (949) 721-6305 or at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated:　　　June 1, 2005　　　　　　By:　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Lee W. Henderson Ph.D.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Registration No. 41,830
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Attorney of Record
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Customer No. 20,995
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(949) 760-0404

1664657//041805

-11-